

Serial No. 10/785,463  
Amendment and Response  
Page 10 of 15

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant and the undersigned thank Examiner Dinh for a careful review of this application. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments to the claims, and in view of the following remarks.

### **Status of the Claims**

After entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1, 3-4, 7 12, 19, 21-22, 25-28, 35-37, 45-46, and 49-50 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 19, and 35 are the independent claims. Applicant has canceled Claims 13-18, 38-44, 47 48, and 51-54 without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added by way of the above amendments.

### **Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action dated February 24, 2005, Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 19, 22, 25-26, 35-37, 45-46, and 49-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,424,859 to *Uehara et al.* ("*Uehara*"), Claims 12 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Uehara* in view of prior art (as described in paragraph 0041 in the present application), and Claims 3, 21 and 28 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant addresses the Examiner's rejections and objections below.

### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to Claims 3, 21 and 28 for being dependent upon a rejected base claim and indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, while Claims 21 and 28 depend from Claim 19. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject

Serial No. 10/785,463  
 Amendment and Response  
 Page 11 of 15

matter. However, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 19 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons discussed below. As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objections to Claims 3, 21 and 28 and the timely allowance of these claims.

#### Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 19, 22, 25-26, 35-37, 45-46, 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Uehara*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

#### Independent Claim 19

With respect to independent Claim 19, the Examiner points to figures 2-3 of *Uehara* as allegedly disclosing the features of a wireless network component (22, 23, 24, 26) that derives power from a power source of a fluorescent light (16), comprising a first power coupling (11) electrically connected to a power converter (24) of the wireless network component and configured for electrically connecting to at least a first pin (21) at a first end of a fluorescent lamp; and a second power coupling (11) electrically connected to the power converter of the wireless network component and configured for connecting to at least a second pin (21) at a second end of the fluorescent lamp to thereby complete a circuit between the power converter, the first pin and the second pin, whereby power supplied to the pins by the power source of the fluorescent light will be drawn by the circuit to power the wireless network component. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of *Uehara*.

In particular, *Uehara* fails to teach or suggest a wireless network component having at least the features of: a first power coupling configured for electrically connecting to at least a first pin at a first end of a fluorescent lamp; and a second power coupling configured for electrically connecting to at least a second pin at a second end of

Serial No. 10/785,463  
 Amendment and Response  
 Page 12 of 15

the fluorescent lamp, as recited in independent Claim 19. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner mistakenly equates the power couplings of the claimed wireless network component with the fluorescent lamp sockets (11) shown in *Uehara*. The fluorescent lamp sockets (11) shown in *Uehara* are part of the fluorescent light fixture (luminaire) and not part of the disclosed transceiver (10). See *Uehara* at col. 5, lines 39-57. Although Applicant believes that Claim 19, as previously presented, was patentable over *Uehara*, Applicant has currently amended the claim to clarify that the claimed power couplings are distinct from fluorescent lamp sockets or other connectors of a fluorescent light fixture. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejection of Claim 19.

#### Independent Claim 1

The Examiner argues that the apparatus shown in figures 2 and 3 of *Uehara* would perform the method of independent Claim 1. Applicant again respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of *Uehara*. The method of Claim 1 comprises the steps of: electrically connecting a first power coupling to at least a first pin located at a first end of a fluorescent lamp, said first power coupling being electrically connected to a power converter of the device; and electrically connecting a second power coupling to at least a second pin located at a second end of the fluorescent lamp, said second power coupling also being electrically connected to the power converter of the device such that a circuit is completed between the power converter, the first pin and the second pin, whereby power supplied to the pins by the power source of the fluorescent light will be drawn by the circuit to power the device. In contrast to the method of claim 1, *Uehara* does not teach or suggest at least the steps of electrically connecting a first power coupling to at least a first pin located at a first end of a fluorescent lamp and electrically

Serial No. 10/785,463  
 Amendment and Response  
 Page 13 of 15

connecting a second power coupling to at least a second pin located at a second end of a fluorescent lamp.

*Uehara* generally teaches that a transceiver (10) can be configured with a tubular (or other shaped) housing (20) that can be mounted within a fluorescent light fixture in place of a fluorescent lamp. See *Uehara* at col. 5, lines 43-57; col. 7, lines 21-25. The transceiver housing (20) includes pins (21) that extend from its ends to draw power from the sockets (11) of the fluorescent light fixture. See *Uehara* at col. 5, lines 43-55. Accordingly, the pins (21) described by *Uehara* are part of the transceiver housing (20) and are not the pins of a fluorescent lamp. The transceiver housing (20) is meant to be inserted into a fluorescent light fixture in place of a fluorescent lamp, meaning that *Uehara* expressly teaches away from the notion of drawing power from the pins of a fluorescent lamp.

*Uehara* discloses an alternate embodiment in which a housing adapter (118), positioned at one or both ends of the transceiver housing (110), may include or constitute a fluorescent lamp. See *Uehara* at col. 10, lines 56-61 and Figure 11. The housing adapter (118) includes base pins (118b) at one end and sockets (118a) at the other. See *Uehara* at col. 10, lines 23-31. The base pins (111) of the transceiver housing (110) couple to the sockets (118a) of the housing adapter (118). Thus, even in embodiments where the housing adapter (118) constitutes a fluorescent lamp, the device of *Uehara* does not include a fluorescent lamp having at least a first pin located at a first end of a fluorescent lamp and at least a second pin located at a second end of the fluorescent lamp.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the method of Claim 1 is neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by *Uehara*. Furthermore, Applicant submits that none of the other prior art references cited by the Examiner disclose, teach or suggest the recited steps of electrically connecting a first power coupling to at least a first pin located at a first end of a fluorescent lamp and electrically connecting a second power coupling to at least a

Serial No. 10/785,463  
Amendment and Response  
Page 14 of 15

second pin located at a second end of the fluorescent lamp. Therefore, Applicant believes that independent Claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Removal of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 35

The Examiner argues that the apparatus shown in figures 2 and 3 of *Uehara* would perform the method of independent Claim 35. Applicant has currently amended Claim 35 in order to clarify that the first power coupling of the device comprises a connector configured to receive at least one pin of a fluorescent lamp and that the second power coupling of the device comprises one or more power coupling pins. Support for this amendment is provided at paragraph 0068 of the present application. Applicant submits that neither *Uehara* nor any other prior art reference of record discloses, teaches or suggests such a device configuration. Therefore, the art of record does not anticipate or render obvious the method of claim 35 and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

Claims 3-4, 7-12 and 45-46 depend from independent Claim 1. Claims 21-22, 25-28 and 49-50 depend from independent Claim 19. Claims 36-37 depend from independent Claim 35. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their respective independent claims, dependent Claims 3-4, 7-12, 21-22, 25-28, 36-37, 45-46 and 49-50 are likewise deemed to be patentable over the prior art of record. Such dependent claims also recite additional features that further define the claimed inventions over the cited prior art references. Applicant submits that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest integrating many of such additional features into the presently claimed inventions. Accordingly, Applicant requests separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim. Minor conforming and/or clarifying amendments

Serial No. 10/783,463  
Amendment and Response  
Page 13 of 13

have been made to several of the dependent claims. Such amendments were not made in view of the prior art.

**Additional Prior Art**

Applicant acknowledges the additional prior art of record, but has not discussed any of those references because they were not relied upon by the Examiner in forming the above-mentioned rejections.

**Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action mailed February 24, 2005. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0980. If there are any issues which can be resolved by telephone conference or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (404) 572-3542.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael S. Pavento*

By: Michael S. Pavento  
Reg. No. 42,985

June 9, 2005  
King & Spalding LLP  
191 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
404.572.4600